

LEAGUE WILL NOT END WAR, SAYS THOMAS

Democratic Senator Warns That Covenant Runs Counter to Trade.

TREATIES SOON BROKEN

Supposed Ardent Supporter Says Pact and Peace Terms Conflict.

Special Despatch to THE SUN.
WASHINGTON, July 29.—In a speech in the Senate today Senator Thomas (Colo.), without attacking the League of Nations covenant but by an analysis of the proposed league in the light of history and the present situation throughout the world, delivered one of the most paralyzing blows yet suffered by the President's followers in this fight.

Until yesterday Mr. Thomas confidently was counted among the faithful Democratic adherents of the league scheme. Following his conference then with President Wilson it became apparent that his own convictions and scruples would guide him rather than any thought of party fealty or political expediency. This impression was more than justified to-day when the Senator summed up his views in these words:

"Wars cannot be averted by any plans, leagues, or precautions, unless the minds of men become averse to war; and I am unable to accept the theory that men can be made merciful, wise, and moderate; that their ambitions can be stifled and their jealousies curbed by treaty regulation."

French Speech Abridged.

Senator Thomas was not the only speaker on the league to-day. Senator Gay (La.) delivered a typical defense at some length, and Senator Francis (Md.) charged that the espionage law was being made use of in some parts of the country to prevent free discussion of the league scheme and the peace treaty provisions.

"It is the apparent purpose of the administration," he said, "to foist this scheme upon the people by a well thought out campaign, cleverly combining propaganda with repression. In certain cities it is impossible to hold a public meeting without the permission of the police."

Senator Francis submitted a copy of a permit granted by Superintendent Robinson of the Philadelphia police for a meeting against the league. The permit was granted, it was stated, on the condition that the utterance of all the speeches would conform to the proclamations issued by the President prohibiting treasonable or seditious utterances.

The Senator from Maryland also presented a statement from the Review, a publication in New York, of July 26 that the Century Company had been informed by a representative of the Department of Justice that action would be brought to prevent the further printing and distribution of Thomas P. Millard's "Democracy and the Eastern Question" because of confidential matter it contained.

"If the purposes of this treaty are compatible with our national traditions and purposes, why must its proponents use methods which are out of harmony with the spirit of free institutions and violate the specific provisions written into the Constitution of our country by the fathers?" asked Senator Francis.

Trade Shatters Peace Dreams.
Senator Thomas told the Senate that the dream of permanent peace had been driven from the minds of men by the emergence of men from tribal life and that every war had closed with treaties bristling with rigid guarantees designed to make peace permanent, but that invariably nations again had absorbed themselves in the more prosaic and profitable pursuits of trade, industry and politics.

Rivalries and commercial competition soon reappear, he said, and the pathway of history "is strewn with a dreary procession of treaties and alliances evolved from the bitter experiences of war and suffering, christened with a benediction of their authors, but foredoomed to failure by the operation of the causes which made their negotiation imperative."

The Senator warned his colleagues of the magnitude and serious nature of the task confronting them in dealing with the peace treaty with the League embodied in it, and added:

"We are confronted at the threshold with the inquiry whether the grateful assumption so confidently and constantly made and so widely accepted that this treaty is a practical guarantee of permanent peace is justified. If it may be sustained, even with some qualifications, our task would be lightened materially by the balancing of results with covenants of dubious expediency. If it will not bear the scrutiny of history, we still may conclude to accept the treaty, but freed from the influence of sentiment which may prove illusory and disappointing. We are legislating, it is said, for all time, and we cannot bow to prediction how exalted so ever its source unless we are very sure of its basic value."

Doubts Wisdom of Punishment.

Turning to history as the best prophet of the future, Senator Thomas demonstrated that neither morals nor religion had kept the world at peace; that the benign influence of Christianity was at floodtide when the world was started. He seriously doubted, also, if the punishment of those responsible for the war would have the benefit claimed for it. He cited the mistake of Great Britain in banishing Napoleon which resulted in crowning him with the immortality of martyrdom.

"I would not mitigate if I could the crimes of Wilhelm II," said Senator Thomas. "No human tribunal can exact adequate retribution for them, but I believe that his trial, conviction and punishment will accomplish only what England accomplished with Bonaparte."

"The influence of a martyred Kaiser

500 Delicious Drinks
You can make them at home with the 500 recipes in
On Uncle Sam's Water Wagon W. H. Moore
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, N. Y. \$1.50 net

15 Reasons
Why First Mortgages Guaranteed by This Company Are the Best Investment for Prudent People.

Our guaranteed mortgages have been tested by the great war as no one believed they would ever have to be tested, and their claim to be the premier security has been completely demonstrated.

Between the entrance of this country into the war and the signing of the armistice, this Company collected and paid to lenders at par \$40,000,000 of principal that fell due.

Has the average investor had any such experience in any other field of investment?

We have guaranteed \$700,000,000 in the past 27 years and no investor has ever lost a dollar.

BOND & MORTGAGE GUARANTEE CO.

Capital and Surplus, \$10,000,000

176 Broadway, New York

175 Nassau St., New York

350 Fifth St., N. Y. City

67 Jackson Ave., Long Island City

may not become as great but may prove quite as potent for war as that of Napoleon."

The Senator asked then if the nature of man had been so chastened by the terrible ordeal since 1914 that he is deterred from such conduct in the contingencies of the future; if greed, avarice and selfish competition have been so destroyed that appeals to conscience or tribunals of arbitration or leagues of nations will supersede resorts to the sword.

World Now More Turbulent.

"The situation everywhere furnishes an eloquent and conclusive answer," said Senator Thomas.

"I affirm without hesitation that the world is to-day more turbulent and more lawless than before the signing of the armistice. Only a few days ago Andrew Bonar Law told the British House of Commons that: twenty-three different wars were then in progress. Revolt or revolution in some part of the world is an every day occurrence. New nations are fighting each other for territory, while the dominant races among them are butchering and despoiling their weaker subjects. The Frankenstein of Bolshevism is covering half of the continent with its bloody tracks and consuming torch. Strikes, riots, murder, lawlessness, disregard of authority, robbery and insurrection in Europe, Asia and Africa have been long a story of each succeeding day."

Following his declaration that parchment barriers to war cannot be effective, the Colorado Senator demonstrated that the principal nations enumerated in the league covenant, while subscribing to all of its idealism, were paying little or no heed to its provisions and apparently have little faith in its efficacy. France, he pointed out, not only disarms Germany, but seeks a defensive alliance with Great Britain and America against her greatest enemy: Italy wants peace, but not without Fiume and most of the Tyrol—if she must choose between them she would take the latter; Japan advocates the league, but subordinates that to demanding Shantung; China, robbed of Shantung and disheartened by Japan's promise to return it, declines the treaty and leaves; Greece is disputing with Italy and France dominion over the coast of Syria and the islands of the eastern Mediterranean.

Who Can Say in View of these Manifestations?

"Who can say in view of these manifestations," the Senator demanded, "that the nations besides our own and recently at war are inclined to a peace with which these demands and ambitions cannot be reconciled?"

Germany will continue to prepare to retaliate for what has been done to her in the peace settlement and her preparations "will not be discouraged by a world's assurance that the horizon of the future shall be overcast by the gathering clouds of war," said Senator Thomas.

"It is everlasting truth that no peace of force ever has outlived the force which imposed it. It binds only

so long as you can make your enemy see behind the parchment the bleeding point of the sword."

Though German arms are overthrown, yet her perfect espionage system still covers the world, Senator Thomas said. She still notes the pulse beats of the nations that thwart her ambition for world dominion.

"And she is sowing the seed of another crop of dragons' teeth in the soil of prostrate Russia, whose hardest of martyrs is foredoomed by the mistaken policy of the Allies toward that unhappy country," he said. "She is now the world's parish. Excluded from the time and perhaps permanently from the League of Nations she will yet be familiar to all its activities. She can widen the differences of its members and subtly strive to encourage them. The conflicting currents of trade and commerce inevitably must create rifts in the scheme of allied unity and the support of 70,000,000 people outside the pale may become a price in national competition for markets and material. Here is a balance of power pregnant with sinister import, one likely to materialize, possibly to be encouraged, by rival ambitions."

Danger of Signation.

The League in its framework is international, federative in character, designed to bind nations together on terms of mutual security. Mr. Thomas pointed out, thus presupposing internationalism. This justifies the inquiry as to whether internationalism will banish war from the earth. The Senator quickly disposed of this question by asserting that it is impossible to extinguish nationalism and patriotism, but that if it could be accomplished, that it would be the end of the world.

"Races may be blended as they mingle in the same communities when enjoying equal privileges as in the United States, but never otherwise," said he. "Their differing color, aptitudes, intelligence, latitudes, foodstuffs, religious institutions and social attributes are fundamental, and these will assert themselves persistently if not offensively to the confusion of internationalists and the joying of empire. Racial instincts and tendencies are the inflexible antipodes to internationalism. They will assert themselves with a vigor and persistence that no harriers can suppress."

The Senator cited innumerable examples in support of this contention.

Menace in Internationalism.

"Internationalism would be a menace if it were not an unattainable dream," said he. "Through no such agency can wars be banished from the affairs of men. But the rule of the law, the rule of internationalism, would establish the lowest, least efficient and most degraded of all forms of government, one that would be a menace to the world."

With the same words he virtually ended the other internationalism, which the prize for which the nations are struggling in eager competition, the Senator pointed out. The world is entering the era of internationalism, and the old rivalries, practices and retaliation will be seen, he said, and these have been the prime source of wars for the past 200 years.

"They will prove the trouble breeders of the future just as surely," said Mr. Thomas. "This is true, albeit commercial treaties establish reciprocal rights and duties between the nations hereafter as heretofore."

The Senator cited President Wilson's declaration of October 28, 1918, to the effect that an insincere and insecure peace only would be established unless the economic rivalries productive of war in the past were definitely excluded.

"I am unable to discover how the pending treaty proposes to exclude economic rivalries unless the plan is to breed in the forty-one articles of Part XIII, outlining the international labor programme," Mr. Thomas asserted. "And if these rivalries are not excluded, what we expect any other than a peace which is insincere and insecure."

Conflicts With Congress.

The Senator said it was impossible to prevent conflict with the powers of Congress in certain parts of the treaty and the league covenant; also he said he had studied cases of human strife in the effect of treaty stipulations and war and peace conditions. This study had convinced him, he said, that the optimism of the ardent league proponents would be disappointed greatly.

"My views may be unfounded and imperfect," he warned the Senate; "they

may indeed be widely erroneous, but I hope that they may contribute in some small measure to the solution of our difficult task. Let us perform it reverently and with abundant care, accepting assurances only when they are fortified by the events of the past, and rejecting predictions which cannot stand the test of patient, exhaustive analysis."

The Senator said he well knew that armaments tend to war and are no guarantee of peace, and that the argument that the League of Nations is the necessary forerunner of disarmament was a powerful argument in its favor. He said he had read the draft of the league many times, and while unable to pass final judgment on its merits he had learned that the League for peace is the unwelcome companion of a peace of force.

"Their ways are divergent, their objectives antipathetic, their details inconsistent. They come to us as one instrument. They are so interblended that familiarity with the whole is essential to an understanding of its parts. It is to me a source of regret, and I am sure that the two could not have been formulated as distinct and separate protocols, a course that its framers would have adopted had the conditions at Versailles made it possible."

The League, inspired by unselfish and uplifting motives, typifies peace and reconciliation," he continued. "The treaty, based upon passion and self-interest, enforces suppression, repression, indemnities, partition punishment."

"Are Mutually Destructive."

Mr. Thomas dilated at length on the divergent objectives of the treaty and the league. Concluding his address the Senator said:

"But the contending elements cannot coexist, for they are mutually destructive. If the conditions of the treaty persist the league will perish. If the covenant survives, the treaty must perish. Its harsher features to conform with the mission of the league. Both cannot endure. In some form the treaty probably will be ratified, and time will determine which of its purposes will survive the other."

"If I could write a covenant for a League of Nations, I would base it on the principle of the abolition of treaties of 1918, and continuing allied association for treaty enforcement, confine it to the English speaking nations and colonies of the world. Their are the institutions of free men, their wealth, the commerce. They are carriers of the sea. They advocate and enforce the impartial administration of justice and of law. They control the armaments and can mobilize the armies that may be needed to enforce the peace of nations."

"No people would disregard the admonition or reject the counsel of such a league. Its benign influence, the ripe effect of centuries of justness and discipline which is the parent of self-government, shedding its rays over the habitable globe, guaranteeing protection and extending aid to those not yet able to move unsupported along the pathway of national development, would do more to minimize the danger of war and promote the ways and the arts of peace than any other international understanding the wit of man can devise. And if these nations be true to themselves and to the impulses of their common sense, whatever we may now do or fail to do, these will in time be leagued by destiny for the harmony and well being of all mankind. If they cannot save the world it is past all redemption."

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL ADMITS FAILURE IN RUSSIA

All British Troops to Be Withdrawn, War Secretary Tells Commons.

NOT TO AID KOLCHAK

Admiral Now Menaced by 800,000 Bolsheviks, and Faces Disaster.

Special Wireless Despatch to THE SUN.

Copyright, 1919, all rights reserved.

LONDON, July 29.—By his admission in the House of Commons that the British venture into Russia has been a complete failure, and that all classes of British troops would be withdrawn, Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, once more laid himself open to attack by newspapers of all shades of political ideas.

The Russian venture is compared to the ill-fated Gallipoli expedition, and while Churchill blames Admiral Kolchak for failure to carry out the plan, there by disrupting the British campaign, it is generally believed that the whole effort has been ill-advised since its inception and that furthermore it is certain to bring disaster to Gen. Denikin and Admiral Kolchak, along with the American and Japanese troops supporting them, for when the British abandon the Archangel region this action will permit the Bolsheviks to turn their whole force against those remaining.

Churchill declared that he had hoped that the British would be able to give assistance to Kolchak, but this is now impossible, owing to the retirement of the White Army. Pointing out the position now occupied by Kolchak, he declared that the Russian commander now is menaced by a force of 800,000 Bolsheviks, and that if Denikin is unable to relieve the pressure there is a great possibility that he, with the supporting Americans, may meet disaster.

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.

"It would be a great mistake to condemn the policy of the allied Powers in regard to this movement," said Col. Churchill. "It was an essential war measure in the battle against Germany that the Allies decided to occupy Archangel and Murmansk. It has achieved greater results than were hoped for, even if it did not achieve all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel."

When the Allies landed at Archangel, Col. Churchill continued, German divisions were passing from the eastern to the western front at the rate of six a month, and that movement was stopped. Early in March the Cabinet decided that Archangel and Murmansk should be evacuated before another winter set in, and directed the War Office to act accordingly and also to send whatever reinforcements that might be necessary for safeguarding the withdrawal. Further, the Minister said, due regard had to be paid to the obligations contracted toward the population and the local Russian Government and the army which had been called into being. The widest latitude was given the military to execute this policy, and its decision was communicated to the Russian leaders, including Admiral Kolchak.

"It may seem heavy all the results expected at the time we landed at Archangel," Col. Churchill continued, "to say, 'Let us get out; let us cut our loss,' but to those on the spot it was a matter of great and painful difficulty to sever ties and quit the scene. I had earnestly hoped and trusted it would be possible for the local North Russian Government to have a separate line after our departure, but after the requirement imposed on Admiral Kolchak, I do not feel that we can indulge in that hope any longer."

Speaking on the general situation, Col. Churchill said Admiral Kolchak's and Gen. Denikin's armies hardly existed a year ago, but that now they were considerable in numbers and were engaging 200,000 Bolsheviks, which was more than two-thirds of their military force. He added that Kolchak was continually retreating, but that Denikin was making formidable advances and that the military question being decided was whether Denikin could continue to advance so as to take part of the pressure from Kolchak, or whether Kolchak could recover and advance to Denikin's aid.

The Bolshevik forces which Kolchak otherwise would be attacking would be attacking weak states with which other Bolsheviks engaged, the Minister said.

Col. Churchill contended that failure to support Kolchak and Denikin would have allowed the Bolsheviks to grow in strength, which would have fatally rearranged the balance in Europe, stifled the League of Nations at the outset and developed a formidable situation. He added that in a few months there would

CHURCHILL EXPLAINS RUSSIAN MOVEMENT

By the Associated Press.

LONDON, July 29.—There was a full attendance of members in the House of Commons to-day to hear Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary of War, explain the Government's Russian policy, which the Liberals and Labor Unionists have been strongly attacking recently.